UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,471	10/02/2003	Kevin P. Baker	10466/484	1021

7590 05/04/2004

K. Shannon Mrksich
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
VOGEL, NANCY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/677,471	BAKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nancy T. Vogel	1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 22-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 22-34 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 October 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119 (e) or 120 as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification of in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120 based upon a previously filed application, specific reference to the earlier filed application must be made in the instant application. For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121 or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of the applications. This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph unless it appears in an application data sheet. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. _____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A priority claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was

unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 22-26, 29 and 31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-32, and 35-37 of copending Application No. 09/944,862. Although the conflicting claims are

not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims recite polypeptide sequences that are at least 80-99% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 83, while the claims of '862 recite polypeptide sequences that are 100% homologous to SEQ ID NO:83; therefore, sequences that are 100% homologous to SEQ ID NO: 83 are encompassed by the instant claims, and furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that variants have high homology would have similar or identical activities.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. The specification as filed does not disclose or provide evidence that a real world utility is associated with the claimed protein. Further experimentation is necessary to attribute a utility to the claimed protein. The specification teaches that the claimed is able to inhibit proliferation of stimulated T-lymphocytes in a MLR assay. However, the ability of a protein to stimulate lymphocyte proliferation in this assay does not support a

specific and substantial utility for the claimed invention. This ability is assayed in an artificial in vitro system and the specification does not provide for what specific conditions or for which specific diseases the claimed invention would predictably function. It is not predictable in which conditions the claimed invention may function, if any. Therefore, the claimed invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

Mixed lymphocyte culture (MLC) is a special case of antigen stimulation in which T lymphocytes respond to foreign histocompatibility antigen on unrelated lymphocytes or monocytes. MLC is a functional assay of cellular response to stimulatory determinants associated predominantly with HLA class II molecules. A single genetic locus or region, known as HLA, controls the MLC reactivity. The MLC assay recognizes disparate HLA class II molecules and the resulting T-cell activation, which is thought to represent an *in vitro* model of the afferent arm of the *in vivo* allograft reaction. The degree of reactivity observed correlates with the degree of antigenic disparity between responding and stimulating cells. Briefly, when the lymphocytes of 2 HLA-disparate individuals are combined in tissue culture, the cells enlarge, synthesize DNA, and proliferate, whereas HLA-identical cells remain quiescent. Since both cells will normally proliferate, a one way test is used to monitor the response of a single responder cell by inactivating the stimulator cell by radiation or drugs in order to inhibit DNA synthesis of the stimulator cell. The proliferation is driven primarily by the differences in the class II HLA antigens between the 2 test cells (or individuals). This reaction is not predictive of general responses of the immune system because, *in vivo*, activation of a lymphocyte

is controlled not only by antigen binding but also by interactions with other cells. All T cells must cooperate with antigen-presenting cells, whereas B cells and cytotoxic T cells depend on helper T lymphocytes. These interactions either require direct surface-to surface contact or are mediated by cytokines that act only over extremely short distances. Because of this interdependence, lymphocyte activation occurs commonly and efficiently in the secondary lymphoid organs, where lymphocytes, antigens, and antigen-presenting cells encounter one another at close quarters. See pages 30-31, 208-209, 246-247 of "Basic and Clinical Immunology," 1994. See also, "Manual of Clinical Laboratory Immunology," 6th Edition at pages 1164-1166.

Kahan clearly states that no *in vitro* immune assay predicts or correlates with *in vivo* immunosuppressive efficacy; there is no surrogate immune parameter as a basis of immunosuppressive efficacy and/or for dose extrapolation from *in vitro* systems to *in vivo* conditions (Cur. Opin. Immunol. 4: 553-560, 1992; see entire document, particularly page 558, column 2). Piccotti et al. (Transplantation 67: 1453-1460, 1999) demonstrate that IL-12 enhances alloantigen-specific immune function as determined by MLC, but this result in vitro does not result in a measurable response *in vivo* (i.e. failure to accelerate allograft rejection) (see page 1459). Campo et al. (Biological Trace Element Res. 79: 15-22, 2001) demonstrate that while zinc suppresses alloreactivity in MLC, it does not decrease T-cell proliferation *in vitro* nor produce immunosuppressive effects *in vivo*. Therefore, the MLC assay, which is art recognized for determining histocompatibility, does not appear to be predictive of general immune responses *in vivo*.

Additionally, difficulties arise in quantification when using MLC as a test for T cell function due to variations in stimulator cell antigens that determine the degree of genetic disparity between stimulator and responder cells. MLC is typically used for determining histocompatibilty in an individual and as a test for immunocompetence of T cells in patients with immunodeficiency disorders. When running the MLC assay for determining histocompatibility for transplantation, autologous controls combining self with irradiated self are necessary to normalize the response of each cell to stimulators. Furthermore, there is known inherent variability of individual cellular responses from day to day which requires performing the entire familial MLC at one time in the case of determining histocompatibility for transplantation (page 246 in "Basic and Clinical Immunlogy"). When performing the MLC assay, each individual lot of a serum source should be screened for growth support capabilities and possible HLA antibodies (see page 1165 in "Manual of Clinical Laboratory Immunology"). Additionally, the screen should include a control response to a pool of allogeneic cells to measure maximum response and an autologous control to ensure low backgrounds.

Therefore, the MLC (a.k.a. MLR) assay is a measure of alloreactivity of one individual to another individual, rather than a general measure of immune function. This reactivity is governed by the antigenic disparity between the two individuals which are being compared in the assay. Depending on the individuals being tested, the MLC may indicate stimulation if they are HLA-disparate or the MLC may indicate no stimulation if the individuals are HLA-identical. The ability of the claimed invention to inhibit

proliferation in the MLC assay may not be a general inhibition of lymphocyte proliferation, but rather a reaction to one of the MHC antigens on the responder cell. The instant specification fails to provide sufficient detail of the assay which was performed and fails to provide any data whatsoever in order for one of ordinary skill in the art to evaluate the conclusion that lymphocyte proliferation was inhibited by the claimed invention. As pointed out above, there are several controls which the art recognizes as being essential for meaningful results for this assay, including autologous controls, a control to determine maximum response, screening for possible HLA antibodies and growth support capabilities. Furthermore, there is known inherent variability of individual cellular responses from day to day, which would clearly dictate the need for internal controls. Lastly, the specification fails to provide any data or evidence of the results of the assay, therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot evaluate the conclusion. The specification states that "any value less than control indicates and inhibitory effect for the test protein" (page 141), however, this does not indicate that statistical significance must occur for determination of a positive result in the assay. In conclusion, the results of the MLC (a.k.a. MLR) assay do not support a specific and substantial utility for the claimed invention because the assay is not predictive of immune response in general, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not expect a inhibitory effect in the MLC assay to correlate to a general inhibitory effect on the immune system, absent evidence to the contrary.

Regarding claims reciting the preamble "An isolated chitinase polypeptide" (claim 29) or "An isolated mucin polypeptide (claim 32), the specification does not provide any

evidence that the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:83 actually has the activity of a mucin or chitinase, or any use of the polypeptide if it indeed possesses such activity, other than as an inhibitor of proliferation of stimulated T-lymphocytes in a MLR assay, as discussed above. Therefore, applicants have not support a specific and substantial utility for the polypeptide, its extracellular domain, or chimeric polypeptides thereof.

Claims 27-34 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

The factors considered when determining if the disclosure satisfies the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue include, but are not limited to: 1) nature of the invention, 2) state of the prior art, 3) relative skill of those in the art, 4) level of predictability in the art, 5) existence of working examples, 6) breadth of claims, 7) amount of direction or guidance by the invention, and 8) quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The claims are drawn to a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 83, or the extracellular domain thereof, with or without a signal peptide, or the transmembrane domain of SEQ ID NO:83, or polypeptides having sequence homology thereto, or chimeric polypeptides thereof. The stated use for the polypeptide is as an inhibitor of the proliferation of T lymphocytes in the in vitro MLR.

The state of the prior art regarding the ability of a protein to inhibit the MLR assay is unpredictable and uncertain, since it is an artificial in vitro system and does not indicate for what specific conditions and for which specific diseases the protein would be useful. While there are many conditions in which the inhibition of the immune response would be beneficial, the mere statement that a particular protein would be useful for any such condition does not constitute an enabling disclosure, since there is no guidance as to such crucial factors such as methods and quantity of administration. Other than the MLR assay, there are no working examples taught in the specification. There is no correlation taught or well known in the art between the MLR reaction and in vivo treatment of diseases involving the immune response. There is no guidance in the specification regarding such matters as patients that would be treated with the disclosed polynucleotides, or methods of administration. The quantity of experimentation required to use the instant invention would be large. Therefore, it is concluded that one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to use the instant invention.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy T. Vogel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 - 3:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

4/28/04

TERRY MCKELVEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER